



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,019	12/03/2003	Gary L. Johnson	CPI-042CN2	8027

959 7590 05/16/2007
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON, MA 02109-2127

EXAMINER

DAVIS, MINH TAM B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/16/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/728,019	Applicant(s) JOHNSON, GARY L.	
	Examiner MINH-TAM DAVIS	Art Unit 1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7-11, 14 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-11, 14 and 353 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/22/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-4, 7-8, species the MEKK1.2 SEQ ID NO:3 in paper of 03/12/07 is acknowledged.

The traverse is on the ground that:

- 1) Groups 1-3 should be re-grouped as a single group, because they are drawn to structurally similar subject matter.
- 2) Groups 4-6 should be rejoined with groups 1-3, because they share common utility, i.e ability to mediate apoptosis, and high degree of homology between the claimed proteins and corresponding variants.

The traverse has been considered but is not found to be persuasive for the following reasons:

- 1) The structure of the mouse, human and rat MEKK1 proteins of groups 1-3 are structurally distinct.
- 2) The variants of groups 4-6 have distinct properties than the corresponding proteins of groups 1-3, because the variants of groups 4-6 are resistant to proteolysis by a caspase.

Applicant cancels claims 2-6.

Accordingly, Group I, claims 1, 7-8 are examined in the instant application.

Sequence Rule

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2).

Art Unit: 1642

However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-25 for the reasons set forth below:

The specification recites sequences without being accompanied by a sequence identification number, for example, on pages 65, 77, and 100.

Proper correction is suggested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, Second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 is indefinite, because it is not clear how “an amino acid sequence”, which reads on a fragment, as small as a few amino acids, could be 95% similar to the full length SEQ ID NO:3.

This rejection could be obviated by amending the claim to replace “an” with “the”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First paragraph, Written Description

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification discloses that protease cleaving at amino acid Asp874 of the MEKK1 SEQ ID NO:3 produces a C-terminal fragment, which is required for inducing cell death (p.96, last paragraph, p.104-105). The specification discloses that both kinase activity and protease cleavage are required to mediate apoptosis (p.109).

The prior art discloses a 1593 amino acid MEKK1 protein which is 95% similar to SEQ ID NO:3 (see US 6,333,170, SEQ ID NO:4).

Claim 8 encompasses a genus of variants of SEQ ID NO:3 with unknown structure and function.

Although drawn to DNA arts, the findings in University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997) and Enzo Biochem, Inc. V. Gen-Probe Inc. are relevant to the instant claims. The Federal Circuit addressed the application of the written description requirement to DNA-related inventions in University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The court stated that “[a] written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name, of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials.” Id. At 1567, 43 USPQ2d at 1405. The court also stated that

a generic statement such as “vertebrate insulin cDNA” or “mammalian insulin cDNA” without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is. Id. At 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406. The court concluded that “naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material.” Id.

Finally, the court addressed the manner by which a genus of cDNAs might be described. “A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNAs, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus.” Id.

The Federal Circuit has recently clarified that a DNA molecule can be adequately described without disclosing its complete structure. See Enzo Biochem, Inc. V. Gen-Probe Inc., 296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Enzo court adopted the standard that □the written description requirement can be met by “show[ing] that an invention is complete by

disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristicsi.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.” Id. At 1324, 63 USPQ2d at 1613 (emphasis omitted, bracketed material in original).

The inventions at issue in Lilly and Enzo were DNA constructs per se, the holdings of those cases are also applicable to claims such as those at issue here.

In this case, the specification does not describe “an amino acid sequence at least 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:3” in a manner that satisfies either the standards as shown in the example of Lilly or Enzo. The specification does not provide sufficient structure or common structure, other than SEQ ID NO: 3, to support the broad breath of the claimed genus. Nor is there any functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function. Although the specification discloses a single protein, SEQ ID NO: 3, this does not provide a description of “an amino acid sequence at least 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:3”, that would satisfy the standard as shown in the example of Enzo.

The specification also fails to describe “an amino acid sequence at least 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:3”, by the standards shown in the example in Lilly. The specification describes only a single polypeptide SEQ ID NO:3. Therefore, it necessarily fails to describe a “representative number” of such species. In addition, the specification also does not describe “structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus.”

Art Unit: 1642

The specification does not provide an adequate written description of “an amino acid sequence at least 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:3” that is required to practice the claimed invention. Thus, the specification does not meet the 112, first paragraph written description requirement, and one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that Applicant did not have possession of “an amino acid sequence at least 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:3” at the time the invention was made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph, Scope

Claims 1, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an active fragment of MEKK1 protein consisting of amino acids 875-1493 of SEQ ID NO:3, wherein said fragment “induces” apoptosis, does not reasonably provide enablement for a fragment of MEKK1 protein having at least 95% identity with an amino acid sequence consisting of about amino acids 875-1493 of SEQ ID NO:3, or consisting of amino acids 875-1493 of SEQ ID NO:3, wherein said fragment “mediates” apoptosis. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

To comply with the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the specification must enable one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation. The claims are evaluated for enablement based on the Wands analysis. Many of the factors regarding undue experimentation have been summarized in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed.Circ.1988) as follows: (1) the nature of the invention, (2) the state of the prior art, (3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, (4) the amount of

Art Unit: 1642

direction or guidance present, (5) the presence or absence of working examples, (6) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (7) the relative skill of those in the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The specification discloses that a 672 amino acids, truncated C-terminal MEKK1 fragment taught by Lange-Carter et al, 1993, is an activated form of MEKK1. The specification discloses that the expression of said fragment induces cell death, which requires the kinase activity of the fragment (p.77-80). The specification discloses that protease cleaving at amino acid Asp874 of the MEKK1 SEQ ID NO:3 produces a C-terminal fragment, which is required for inducing cell death (p.96, last paragraph, p.104-105), and that both kinase activity and protease cleavage are required to mediate apoptosis (p.109). The specification does not disclose that the C-terminal fragment also decreases or inhibits apoptosis.

However, “mediating” apoptosis as claimed in claims 1, 7 encompasses decreasing or abolishing apoptosis.

One does not expect nor one can predict that the active C-terminal fragment of SEQ ID NO:3 could have opposite function, i.e. decreasing or abolishing apoptosis.

Given the above unpredictability, and in view of the complex nature of the invention, a lack of sufficient disclosure in the specification, and little is known in the art concerning the claimed invention, it would have been undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention, that is commensurate in scope of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lange-Carter et al, 1993, Science, 260 (5106): 315-319.

Claim 1 is drawn to: An isolated active fragment of an MEKK1 protein consisting of an amino acid sequence having at least 95% identity to an amino acid sequence consisting of “about” amino acids 875-1493 of SEQ ID NO:3, wherein said active fragment mediates apoptosis.

Claim 7 is drawn to: The active fragment of claim 1, which consists of “about” amino acids 875-1493 of SEQ ID NO:3.

The language “consisting of about” is reasonably interpreted as an open language, comprising.

Query Match 100.0%; Score 3213; DB 2; Length 687;
Best Local Similarity 100.0%; Pred. No. 2.5e-123;
Matches 619; Conservative 0; Mismatches 0; Indels 0; Gaps 0;

Qy	1	GHQDSLQAVAPTSCLENS	SLEHTVHREKTGKGLSATRLS	SASSEDISDRLAGVSVGLPSST	60
Db	69	GHQDSLQAVAPTSCLENS	SLEHTVHREKTGKGLSATRLS	SASSEDISDRLAGVSVGLPSST	
128					
Qy	61	TTEQPKPAVQTKGRPHS	QCLNSSPLSHAQLMFPAPS	APCSSAPSVDPISKHRPQAFVPCK	
120					
Db	129	TTEQPKPAVQTKGRPHS	QCLNSSPLSHAQLMFPAPS	APCSSAPSVDPISKHRPQAFVPCK	
188					
Qy	121	IPASASPQTQRKFSLQF	QRNCSEHRDSDQLSPVFT	QSRPPSSNIHRPKSRPVPGSTSKL	
180					

Art Unit: 1642

Db 189 IPSASPQTQRKFSLQFQRNCSEHRSDQLSPVFTQSRPPSSNIHRPKPSRPVPGSTSKL
 248
 Qy 181 GDATAKSSMTLDLGSASRCDDSFSGGGNSGNAVIPSDET VFTPVEDKCRLDVNTELNSSIE
 240
 Db 249 GDATAKSSMTLDLGSASRCDDSFSGGGNSGNAVIPSDET VFTPVEDKCRLDVNTELNSSIE
 308
 Qy 241 DLLEASMPSSD TTVTFKSEVAVLSPEKAENDDTYKDDVNHNQKCKEKMEAE EEEALAIAM
 300
 Db 309 DLLEASMPSSD TTVTFKSEVAVLSPEKAENDDTYKDDVNHNQKCKEKMEAE EEEALAIAM
 368
 Qy 301 AMSASQDALPIVPQLQVENGEDIIIIQQDTPETLPGHTKAKQPYREDAEWLKGQQIGLGA
 360
 Db 369 AMSASQDALPIVPQLQVENGEDIIIIQQDTPETLPGHTKAKQPYREDAEWLKGQQIGLGA
 428
 Qy 361 FSSCYQAQDVGTGTLMAVKQVTYVRNTSSEQEEVVEALREEIRMMGHLNHPNIIIRMLGAT
 420
 Db 429 FSSCYQAQDVGTGTLMAVKQVTYVRNTSSEQEEVVEALREEIRMMGHLNHPNIIIRMLGAT
 488
 Qy 421 CEKSNYNLFIEWMAGGSVAHLLSKYGAFKESVVINYTEQLLRGLSYLHENQIIHRDVKGA
 480
 Db 489 CEKSNYNLFIEWMAGGSVAHLLSKYGAFKESVVINYTEQLLRGLSYLHENQIIHRDVKGA
 548
 Qy 481 NLLIDSTGQRLRIADFGAAARLASKGTGAGEFQGQLLGTIAFMAPEVLRGQQYGRSCDVW
 540
 Db 549 NLLIDSTGQRLRIADFGAAARLASKGTGAGEFQGQLLGTIAFMAPEVLRGQQYGRSCDVW
 608
 Qy 541 SVGCAIIEMACAKPPWNAEKHSNHLALIFKIASATTAPSIPSHLSPGLRDVAVRCLELQP
 600
 Db 609 SVGCAIIEMACAKPPWNAEKHSNHLALIFKIASATTAPSIPSHLSPGLRDVAVRCLELQP
 668
 Qy 601 QDRPPSRELLKHPVFRTTW 619
 Db 669 QDRPPSRELLKHPVFRTTW 687

2. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipate by

US 6,333,170 (Johnson, G L, Filed on 04/05/1996).

Art Unit: 1642

Db 102 MAAAAGDRASSSGFPGAAAASPEAGGGGGGGGALQGSGAPAAGAAGLLREPGSAGPSART
161

Qy 61 -----WRRRQLRKVRSVELDQLPEQPLFLAAASPPCPSTSPSPEPADAAAG---
106

Db 162 GGGGTCAKCGVSWTSCRSSRS-----SSPP-PRRPAHLLPVAGARGRGC
205

Qy 107 ASRFQPA-AGPPPPGAASRCGSHSAELAAARDSGARSPAGAEPPSAAAPSGREMENKETL
165

Db 206 RSESLPARAGPPPPGAASRCGSHSAELAAARDSGARSPAGAEPPSAAAPSGREMENKETL
265

Qy 166 KGLHKMEDRPEERMIREKLKATCMPAWKHEWLERRNRRGPVVVKPIPIKGDGSEVNNLAA
225

Db 266 KGLHKMEDRPEERMIREKLKATCMPAWKHEWLERRNRRGPVVVKPIPIKGDGSEVNNLAA
325

Qy 226 EPQGEGQAGSAAPAPKGRRSPSPGSSPSGRSVKPESPGVRRKRVSPVPFQSGRITPPRA
285

Db 326 EPQGEGQAGSAAPAPKGRRSPSPGSSPSGRSVKPESPGVRRKRVSPVPFQSGRITPPRA
385

Qy 286 PSPDGFSPYSPEETSRRVNKVMRARLYLLQQIGPNSFLIGGDSPDNKYRVFIGPQNCSCG
345

Db 386 PSPDGFSPYSPEETSRRVNKVMRARLYLLQQIGPNSFLIGGDSPDNKYRVFIGPQNCSCG
445

Qy 346 RGAFCIHLLFVMLRVFQLEPSDPMLWRKTLKNFEVESLFQKYHSRRSSRIKAPSRNTIQK
405

Db 446 RGAFCIHLLFVMLRVFQLEPSDPMLWRKTLKNFEVESLFQKYHSRRSSRIKAPSRNTIQK
505

Qy 406 FVSRMSNSHTLSSSSTSTSSSENSIKDEEEQMCPICLLGMLDEESLTVCEDGCRNKLHHH
465

Db 506 FVSRMSNSHTLSSSSTSTSSSENSIKDEEEQMCPICLLGMLDEESLTVCEDGCRNKLHHH
565

Qy 466 CMSIWAEECRRNREPLICPLCRSKWRSHDFYSHELSSPVESPASLRAVQQPSSPQQPVAG
525

Db 566 CMSIWAEECRRNREPLICPLCRSKWRSHDFYSHELSSPVESPASLRAVQQPSSPQQPVAG
625

Qy 526 SQRRNQESSFNLTHFGTQQIPSAYKD LAEPWIQVFGMELVGCLFSRNWNVREMA LRRLSH
585

|||||

Art Unit: 1642

Db 626 SQRRNQESSFNLTHFGTQQIPSAKYDLAEPWIQVFGMELVGCLFSRNWNVREMA LRRLSH
685

Qy 586 DVSGALLLANGESTGNSGGGSGGSL SAGAASGSSQPSISGDVVEACCSVLSIVCADPVYK
645

Db 686 DVSGALLLANGESTGNSGGGSGGSL SAGAASGSSQPSISGDVVEACCSVLSIVCADPVYK
745

Qy 646 VYVAALKTLRAMLVYTPCHSLAERIKLQRLLRPVVD TILVKCADANSRTS QLSISTVLEL
705

Db 746 VYVAALKTLRAMLVYTPCHSLAERIKLQRLLRPVVD TILVKCADANSRTS QLSISTVLEL
805

Qy 706 CKGQAGELAVGREILKAGSIGVGGVDYVLSCILGNQAESNNWQELLGR LCLIDRLLLEFP
765

Db 806 CKGQAGELAVGREILKAGSIGVGGVDYVLSCILGNQAESNNWQELLGR LCLIDRLLLEFP
865

Qy 766 AEFYPHIVSTDVSQAEPVEIRYKLLSLLTFALQSIDNSHSMVGKLSRRIYLSSARMVTA
825

Db 866 AEFYPHIVSTDVSQAEPVEIRYKLLSLLTFALQSIDNSHSMVGKLSRRIYLSSARMVTA
925

Qy 826 VPAVFSKLVTMLNASGSTHFTRMRRRLMAIADEVEIAEVIQLGVEDTV DGHQDSLQAVAP
885

Db 926 VPAVFSKLVTMLNASGSTHFTRMRRRLMAIADEVEIAEVIQLGVEDTV DGHQDSLQAVAP
985

Qy 886 TSCLENSSLEHTVHREKTGKGLSATRLSASSEDISDRLAGVSVGLPSSTTTEQPKPAVQT
945

Db 986 TSCLENSSLEHTVHREKTGKGLSATRLSASSEDISDRLAGVSVGLPSSTTTEQPKPAVQT
1045

Qy 946 KGRPHSQCLNSSPLSHAQLMFPAPSAPCSSAPSVDPISKHRPQAFVPCKIP SASPQTQRK
1005

Db 1046 KGRPHSQCLNSSPLSHAQLMFPAPSAPCSSAPSVDPISKHRPQAFVPCKIP SASPQTQRK
1105

Qy 1006 FSLQFQRNCSEHRDSDQLSPVFTQSRPPSSNIHRPKPSRPVPGSTSKLGDATKSSMTLD
1065

Db 1106 FSLQFQRNCSEHRDSDQLSPVFTQSRPPSSNIHRPKPSRPVPGSTSKLGDATKSSMTLD
1165

Qy 1066 LGSASRCDDSFGGGNSGNAVIPSEDTVFTPVEDKCRLDVNTLNSSIEDLLEASMPSSD
1125

Art Unit: 1642

Db 1166 LGSASRCDDSFGGGNSGNAVIPSDETVFTPVEDKCRLDVNTELNSSIEDLLEASMPSSD
1225

Qy 1126 TTVTFKSEVAVLSPEKAENDDTYKDDVNHQKCKEKEAEEEEALAIAMAMSASQDALPI
1185

Db 1226 TTVTFKSEVAVLSPEKAENDDTYKDDVNHQKCKEKEAEEEEALAIAMAMSASQDALPI
1285

Qy 1186 VPQLQVENGEDI IIIQQDTPETLPGHTKAKQPYREDAEWLKGQQIGLGFSSCYQAQDVG
1245

Db 1286 VPQLQVENGEDI IIIQQDTPETLPGHTKAKQPYREDAEWLKGQQIGLGFSSCYQAQDVG
1345

Qy 1246 TGTLMVAKQVTYVRNTSSEQEEVVEALREEIRMMGHLNHPNIIRMLGATCEKSNYNLFIE
1305

Db 1346 TGTLMVAKQVTYVRNTSSEQEEVVEALREEIRMMGHLNHPNIIRMLGATCEKSNYNLFIE
1405

Qy 1306 WMAGGSVAHLLSKYGAFKESVVINYTEQLLRGLSYLHENQIIHRDVKGANLLIDSTGQRL
1365

Db 1406 WMAGGSVAHLLSKYGAFKESVVINYTEQLLRGLSYLHENQIIHRDVKGANLLIDSTGQRL
1465

Qy 1366 RIADFGAAARLASKGTGAGEFQGQLLGTIAFMAPEVLRGQQYGRSCDVWSVGCAIEMAC
1425

Db 1466 RIADFGAAARLASKGTGAGEFQGQLLGTIAFMAPEVLRGQQYGRSCDVWSVGCAIEMAC
1525

Qy 1426 AKPPWNAEKHSNHLALIFKIASATTAPSIPSHLSPGLRDVAVRCLELQPQDRPPSRELLK
1485

Db 1526 AKPPWNAEKHSNHLALIFKIASATTAPSIPSHLSPGLRDVAVRCLELQPQDRPPSRELLK
1585

Qy 1486 HPVFRTTW 1493
1585

Db 1586 HPVFRTTW 1593

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH-TAM DAVIS whose telephone number is 571-272-0830.

The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-5:30 PM.


Art Unit: 1642

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SHANON FOLEY can be reached on 571-272-0898. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MINH TAM DAVIS

April 26, 2007


SHANON FOLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600